

REMARKS

Claims 1-42 remain pending in the present application. Applicant amends Claims 1, 5, 6, 13, 14-16, 24, 28, 29, and 36-42 to clarify claimed subject matter and/or correct informalities. The original specification and drawings support these claim amendments at least at pages 7-13, 20, and in Figures 1, 4, 6, and 8. Therefore, these revisions introduce no new matter.

Claims 1-42 are for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. Applicant requests favorable consideration of this response and allowance of the subject application based on the following remarks.

Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's participation in a telephonic conference of April 16, 2007. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting the interview.

During the interview, the claimed subject matter of the application and the Vaughan, DuBois, and Suorsa references were discussed. In particular, Applicant presented arguments along the lines of those set forth below in the section entitled "Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103". Specifically, Applicant presented arguments as to how the subject matter in the application contains features, such as providing a library, generic objects, parameters, a configuration site comprising a local database and a central database.

Also discussed during the interview were proposed amendments to the claims. In the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant proposed to amend each of the independent claims to further clarify features

of Applicant's claimed subject matter. Applicant is submitting the amendments in writing in the Response to the Office Action.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 5, 13, 15, 28, 36, and 39-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. In the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has amended Claims 5, 13, 15, 28, 36, and 39-42 to further clarify features of Applicant's subject matter. For example, Claim 13 as amended recites in part, "computer readable storage medium executed on a computing device". The other claims have been amended along the same features. Therefore, these claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. §101 and as a result, the rejection is now moot. Applicant respectfully request the §101 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

A. **Claims 24-28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by non patent literature, GNU Autoconf, Automake and Libtool, 1st edition, published Oct. 2000 by Vaughan et al. (hereinafter "Vaughan").

B. **Claims 29 and 31-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by non patent literature, "Software Portability with imake", 1st edition, published on July 1993 by Paul DuBois (hereinafter "DuBois").

C. **Claims 14, 16-23, and 37-39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,152,109 to Suorsa et al. (hereinafter "Suorsa").

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. **Claims 7, 30, and 42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by non patent literature, GNU Autoconf, Automake and Libtool, 1st edition, published Oct. 2000 by Vaughan et al. (hereinafter "Vaughan") in view of Jacquemot.

B. **Claims 1-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by non patent literature, GNU Autoconf, Automake and Libtool, 1st edition, published Oct. 2000 by Vaughan et al. (hereinafter "Vaughan")

C. **Claims 6, 8-13, 15, and 40-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable being unpatentable by non patent literature, "Software Portability with imake", 1st edition, published on July 1993 by Paul DuBois (hereinafter "DuBois").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claims 6-13, 15, 29-36, and 40-42

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended **independent Claim 6**, to clarify further features of the subject matter. Claim 6 now recites:

An apparatus for generating configuration instructions used to build a programmable machine, comprising:

a build management logic configured to automate building by creating a library;

the library having generic objects representing aspects of a configuration process;

a template providing a framework representing the programmable machine in combination with information in the library to reconstruct a description of the programmable machine;

the build management logic configured to generate the configuration instructions used to build the programmable machine by organizing the

generic objects in the library based on a framework established by the template; and

the build management logic is further configured to provide an user interface displaying predetermined templates to accept input in response to the predetermined templates.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such apparatus is disclosed, taught or suggested by DuBois.

DuBois Fail to Disclose , Teach or Suggest , Parameter Values, Programmable Machines

DuBois is directed towards software portability with *imake* (Title). DuBois describes how *imake* automatically uses knowledge to rebuild Makefiles without intervention, when software is moved to different machines (page 8, lines 16-18), not build a programmable machine. Furthermore, the parameter values in the configuration files are entered initially by someone (page 23, lines 20-21), not using a build management logic. Therefore, Dubois fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "a build management logic configured to automate building by creating a library; a template providing a framework representing the programmable machine in combination with information in the library to reconstruct a description of the programmable machine", as recited in Applicant's Claim 6.

Independent Claims 15, 29, and 40 are directed to a computer readable storage media, a method, and a computer-readable storage media, respectively. Each of these claims is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 6.

Dependent Claims 7-13, 30-36, and 41-42 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 6, 29, and 40, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claims 6, 15, 29, and 40, are not disclosed, taught or

suggested by DuBois. As each and every element is not disclosed, taught or suggested by DuBois, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 and §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5 and 24-28

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended **independent Claim 1**, to clarify further features of the subject matter. Claim 1 now recites:

An apparatus for generating configuration instructions to build a programmable machine, comprising:

a build management logic configured to automate building by creating a script library in a standardized and a generic form;

the script library comprising:

a plurality of objects representing aspects of a configuration process for a specific collection of programmable machines; and

a plurality of parameters associated with respective objects, wherein at least one of the parameters includes an unspecified value for the generic form; and

the build management logic configured to specify a set of objects from the script library to implement the configuration of the programmable machine, and to generate the configuration instructions from the set of objects;

wherein the build management logic is further configured to determine the unspecified value when generating configuration instructions for the specific combination of programmable machines; and

the build management logic is further configured to provide an user interface to manage data assignment for the specific collection of programmable machines, wherein the user interface accepts input and returns output.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such apparatus is disclosed, taught or suggested by Vaughan.

Vaughan Fails to Disclose, Teach or Suggest, Library, Programmable Machines

Vaughan is directed towards managing a minimal project using GNU Autotools (page 21). Vaughan specifically states “this package does not produce any libraries of its own, so Libtool does not feature them in this chapter” (page 21). Furthermore, Vaughan builds intermediate files for programs (page 22, lines 16-22), not “the build management logic configured to specify a set of objects from the script library to implement the configuration of the programmable machine”, as recited in Applicant’s Claim 1. Thus, Vaughan fails to disclose, teach or suggest “a build management logic configured to automate building by creating a script library in a standardized and a generic form and the build management logic configured to specify a set of objects from the script library to implement the configuration of the programmable machine”, as recited in Applicant’s Claim 1.

Independent Claim 24 is directed to a method, and is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-5 and 25-28 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1 and 24, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claims 1 and 24, are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Vaughan. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 and §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 16-23, and 37-39

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended **independent Claim 14**, to clarify further features of the subject matter. Claim 14 now recites:

A system for generating configuration instructions used to build a programmable machine, comprising:
a head-end site, including:
head-end logic configured to interact with a remote client site;
a central database coupled to the head-end logic, the central database containing at least one package that specifies configuration instructions, at least one package including:
a plurality of objects representing aspects of a configuration process;
a plurality of parameters associated with respective objects; and
at least one template for organizing the plurality of objects in accordance with a predetermined framework;
a configuration site, including:
a local database for storing configuration instructions used to configure at least one machine associated with the configuration site;
logic configured to receive and store the at least one package in the local database; and
logic configured to generate configuration instructions used to configure at least one programmable machine based on the at least one package;
wherein a group of interrelated machines may be built by downloading one or more packages;
wherein the configuration of the machines may be changed by loading another package.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such apparatus is disclosed by Suorsa.

Suorsa Fails to Disclose Building a Programmable Machine

Suorsa is directed towards provisioning of servers and other computing devices that provide support for sites hosted on the Internet, intranets, and other communication networks (col. 1, lines 14-17). Figure 7 of Suorsa shows the functions are to maintain information about all of the devices and to store and provide the software that is loaded on these devices (col. 9, lines 46, 49-51), not generating configuration instructions to build a programmable machine, as recited in Applicant's Claim 14. Thus, Suorsa fails to disclose "logic configured to generate configuration instructions used to configure at least one programmable machine based on the at least one package; wherein a group of interrelated machines may be built by

downloading one or more packages; wherein the configuration of the machines may be changed by loading another package”, as recited in Applicant’s Claim 14.

Independent Claims 16 and 37 are directed to an apparatus and a method, and each is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 14. For example, Suorsa also fails to disclose “a build management logic configured to automate building by creating a library; a template providing a framework in combination with the library to reconstruct a description of the programmable machine”, as recited in Applicant’s **Claim 16**. Furthermore, Suorsa fails to disclose “generating configuration instructions for a specific combination of programmable machines based on the predetermined framework; and providing an user interface to manage data assignment for the specific collection of programmable machines, wherein the user interface accepts input and returns output”, as recited in Applicant’s **Claim 37**. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 16 and 37 be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 17-23 and 38-39 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 16 and 37, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claims 16 and 37, are not disclosed by Suorsa. As each and every element is not disclosed by Suorsa, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

References Do Not Disclose, Teach or Suggest Features

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose each and every element of the claimed subject matter. For all of these reasons, the §102 rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all of these reasons, the §103(a) rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

Dated: 5-17-2007

By: Shirley Lee Anderson
Shirley Lee Anderson
Reg. No. 57,763
(509) 324-9256 ext. 258